

MERRILL-PALMER

QUARTERLY

of

Behavior and Development

Established to further the objectives of The Merrill-Palmer School by presenting material relative to the concerted efforts of numerous professional disciplines toward the advancement of knowledge in the many areas of family living.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor, Ralph E. Sloan

D. Keith Osborn, *Book Reviews*

Ivor Johnson Echols

Martin L. Hoffman

Richard K. Kerckhoff

William W. McKee

Aaron L. Rutledge

Marjorie D. Sanger

Leland H. Stott

Volume 5, No. 2

Winter, 1959

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
CHALLENGE OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION	
Lawrence K. Frank	67
A PHILOSOPHY FOR FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION	
Owen Morgan	80
NEW TRENDS IN FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION	
Richard Kerckhoff	85
THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN FAMILY LIFE AND PARENT EDUCATION	
Irving Sigel	91
THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF DEVELOPMENT	
Byron O. Hughes	103
BOOK REVIEWS	108

THE MERRILL-PALMER SCHOOL • 71 East Ferry Avenue, Detroit 2, Michigan

C

cu
li
th

ha
no

gr
be
w
as
un
on
an
a
lo
an
ni
fr
li
m
an
ta
cu
re
le
inc
to
gr
th
ma
vie

in
19

CHALLENGE OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION *

LAWRENCE K. FRANK †

Family living in the next three or four decades will, I believe, be cumulatively altered. Adolescents and young adults of today will be living in the year 2000 and will have to achieve those changes in and through their personal lives.

What kind of family living is likely to arise, recognizing that we have already revised and replaced much of what was long considered normal and desirable in families?

We realize that families are no longer the large, extended kinship groups engaged in making a living on farms, but more and more are becoming the so-called nuclear family-husband, wife, and children, with one or two of the grandparents likely to be living with them, only as these parents grow older. These nuclear families are predominantly urban dwellers, but subject to frequent moves within the same locality or to other areas. The husband-father and increasingly the wife-mother are engaged in gainful occupations, *earning* a living, instead of making a living, and therefore economically vulnerable to depression, prolonged illness, layoffs, strikes, and technological obsolescence. They are increasingly dependent upon machinery, power equipment, technical services to maintain the home, and also many personal services from the various helping professions. Both husband and wife are living longer, with wives outliving their husbands so that there are more and more widows. Also, we see more separation and divorces and remarriages in middle and later years of life. The almost spectacular rise in income since 1930, the provision of various social security aids to families, the gradual improvement of housing, all the recognized economic aspects of family living, have become less and less controlling. Accordingly, the problems we face in the family are increasingly cultural and psychological and therefore more accessible to education. This economic improvement has been augmented by the growing number of services for families, the improving practice of all the helping professions, and the impact of commercial advertising and magazines upon family living, persuading families to accept new devices, foods, furnishings, recreation and leisure-time programs.

* Presented before the National Training Conference in Extension Education in Family Life, at The Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Michigan, September 12, 1958.

† Formerly, Director of the Caroline Zachry Institute, New York City.

What are we to say about these changed patterns? Will they continue and become more frequent—what may alter or redirect them? Do we expect that families will, during the next four decades, become more alike or differentiated? We should recognize that when we raise these questions about the future of the family we are not thinking in terms of superhuman trends, of inexorable forces coercing families. What happens to the family will be the result of choices and decisions by individual families who will attempt to cope with their life tasks, will try to meet the demands of an industrialized society in ways which will shape their home and family living. We cannot too strongly emphasize that we are dealing with human conduct, human decisions, human aspirations, not impersonal trends or so-called social forces which are purely metaphors that obscure the basic source of all social life in human behavior.

When we try to look ahead to see what people will do and what they will be striving for, we should be alert to various aspects.

Consider the great variety of family patterns in the United States. Not only are there various regional patterns and urban, rural, small-town contrasts, but there are innumerable ethnic-cultural and religious patterns. Various observers have pointed out how the Irish, German, Italian, Negro, Jewish, and all the other ethnic-cultural groups exhibit characteristic family configurations, patterns of relationships with their own versions of the masculine-feminine, husband-wife, parent-child roles that are clearly recognizable in what they do and how they live. Then there are the various social-economic levels and religious patterns. We should not forget the various tightly organized religious groups.

We see how the traditional familiar pattern of family life has been superseded in innumerable families whose principal wage earner works all night or on shifts that no longer permit the usual daily schedule of living. There is a growing number of persons who are away from home for varying periods of time—salesmen; transportation workers on railroads, buses, airplanes, steamships; as well as those who are assigned to duty at different locations out of the country, such as military personnel, employees of corporations with foreign plants and operations, or personnel of foreign missions sent by the U.S. Government or the United Nations to foreign lands for varying periods of time, often taking the wife and small children to live for a year or longer in utterly strange situations. Each occupational group tends to develop its own pattern of family living.

Do we expect these current patterns to continue, to change or to be revised, even reversed?

We must make some assumptions about the future of family living if our programs of education for marriage and family living are to be

relevant and appropriate for the kind of living with which students and adults will be confronted in the years ahead.

In the old love stories the ending was, "and they were married and lived happily ever afterwards." But today marriage is highly problematic and uncertain. No young woman can reasonably expect that the choices and decisions she makes about a husband, a home, a family, her own job or non-working, will be more than temporary since they may all change suddenly and unexpectedly. Marriage and family living today are inevitably precarious and may continue so for some generations since cultural, social evolution will continue, probably at an ever-accelerated pace. Our awareness of these prospects should be communicated so that young people, especially women, will realize that courageous, flexible, imaginative thinking and acting are essential to marriage today. So many of our educational programs are preparing children, youth, and young adults for a world that no longer exists, continuing to teach what is no longer relevant nor appropriate nor consonant with recent research and findings. It is especially important, therefore, in family life education to be aware of our often unspoken assumptions and expectations and equally of how our personal background and inclinations may bias our thinking and teaching.

Can we assume that these differentiated patterns of family living will not only continue but will probably multiply, so that when we speak of family living we no longer can point to any one dominant or controlling pattern, nor expect to find the traditional family configurations and activities except in a progressively smaller minority?

Then we also should ask what we can expect in the way of time and energy available for family living. Earlier on the farm where everyone was occupied with the innumerable and unending chores, family living was a byproduct of making a living, housekeeping, and the numerous craft productions carried on. Today we see shorter daily hours of work, shorter workweek and longer weekends, with holidays, longer annual even semiannual vacations, providing more time for living and for what we call leisure and recreation. This has been hailed as fostering more family togetherness (with acknowledgment, of course, to *McCalls!*). Is there perhaps a limit to the amount of togetherness which is desirable, especially if in our modern housing and in our occupations there is little or no place or time for privacy, for being alone at times for reflection, rest, and doing what one enjoys by him or herself?

Some believe the desire for privacy, for aloneness, is going or gone—that we have lost the capacity to endure even short periods of isolation and no longer can endure solitude for even the briefest time. We carry portable radios and phonographs wherever we go, and must be in continual verbal communication with others to feel at ease. Some

cultures have developed this need for close, intimate, continual contact so that the individuals are disconcerted when isolated, as among the Balinese.

What kind of family living are we educating for—what patterns and relations do we believe should be fostered? Are we able to recognize how much our own personal idiosyncratic life experience and preferences may bias and disturb our family life education, leading us to impose our own way on others? Social workers used to do this, attempting to impose middle-class patterns and practices upon their clients of lower social-economic and different ethnic-cultural backgrounds. Are we doing this in family life education, and if so, are we creating more confusion and conflicts in families as we try to make everyone conform to the norms we favor?

Are we prepared to accept as highly probable the emergence of many different patterns of marriage or family living going far beyond what we ourselves have experienced or prefer?

Formerly marriages were arranged and a woman was betrothed to a man selected and approved by her father, regardless of her own personal likes and feelings. Today we believe that individual choice of a spouse is essential to the dignity of women, who are no longer chattels to be bartered for the highest bride price nor married off with a dowry to persuade a man to take her.

But the passing of the older marriage arrangements has created new perils and uncertainties since young men and women are now marrying with little or no awareness of each other's background or personality, and finding themselves often in a marriage, trying to maintain a family and rear children with little or no shared ideals, beliefs, or aspirations. Sexual attraction alone is rarely sufficient to sustain a family which is essentially a way of living expressive of individual aspirations and feelings of responsibility to others, especially the spouse and children. These aspirations and expectations are not easily modified. If not congenial they may block the efforts to create a family life.

It seems likely that individuals and families will increasingly face the task of establishing and maintaining relations which are no longer based upon and supported by the historic relations and associations of the past. Thus we are living and compelled to meet, work, play, and marry with others who are not related to us by kinship (which has been the most coercive pattern in human relations); not known to us as neighbors and fellow townsmen, since we are leaving our native homes and moving around the country and the world; not sharers in the same ethnic-cultural traditions, since we are increasingly living among and marrying persons of all the different traditions of the world

now resident in the United States; and not sharers of the same religious beliefs and practices.

We have little or no preparation or orientation for these new relations into which we are entering—no guiding traditions for finding new friends and associates, for selecting a husband or wife among these strangers—yet select we must because there are few remaining alternatives except for those who remain in the several enclaves of their own people and continue the old traditional ways of living—a diminishing number except for a few vigorous groups like the Mormons, the Hutterites, and similar strong “in-groups.”

Should we accept the prospect that marriage and family functions will be undertaken by individuals whose own individual life experiences and traditions will not be shared by their spouse, whose conception of the masculine-feminine roles, of the parent roles, of sexual relations and obligations, of family living and its responsibilities and privileges, will often be different, even in conflict, so that they face all the tasks of establishing and maintaining a home, creating a marriage, and living as a family with little or no common beliefs, assumptions or expectations, or shared life experiences?

What kind of education for marriage and family living can we provide that will be genuinely helpful and appropriate? Can we legitimately set up a program of what families should do and not do, based upon one norm or modal pattern, and expect them to conform to that when that norm or modal pattern may be not only inappropriate, but self-defeating, already more or less anachronistic? Should we look forward to a multimodal family life and expect marriages and families to be highly diverse?

Should we in planning our programs consider the implications of what we are offering to young men and women or older married men and women for their personality development and mental health? How relevant do we consider the truly revolutionary changes that are taking place in the concept and pattern of marriage today and also the new insights into personality?

We recognize, at least we acknowledge, that the traditional masculine and feminine roles are being questioned and often superseded by individuals who are desperately striving to find some new and more fulfilling ways of establishing a sustained reciprocal relationship—in and through which their maleness and femaleness may be translated or transformed into a reciprocally related, polarized masculinity and femininity.

Not only from clinical studies and larger investigations but from contemporary novels and plays, we find evidence of many explorations and of varied experimentations, of often tragic rebellion against older

norms and prescriptions, of what is appropriate or required for the man and for the woman.

The traditional moral codes regarding sex are less and less controlling today and we are seeing the emergence of various sex relations that often seem irresponsible and self-defeating. We are realizing even more clearly that we have had no sex ethics but have relied upon prohibitions and taboos which may be rejected among people with no criteria for their personal relations. We lack a sex ethic for marriage just as we lack an ethic for interpersonal relations in the family where individuals feel free to inflict any indignity and humiliation upon their spouse or their children, assuming that so long as it is in the family the law will not interfere except for extreme cases.

Significant for the future of marriage and family living is the emergence of two human rights that women are now seeking—rights which in my opinion may be more far-reaching in their consequences for the future of our society and the redirection of our culture than those we are so concerned over today.

Women, as I see it, are asking for control over their own person in marriage, so that they are not expected or required to perform unwelcome conjugal duties, to use the legal and theological language. And women are asking for control over their own fertility—to bear or not to bear a child according to their own desires and readiness.

These two new human rights, as I see them, are expressions of our enduring goal values and historic aspirations toward human dignity which we have for centuries denied to women along with the other limitations upon their personal, legal, political, social, economic, and educational development and activities. Only today are we beginning to accord women recognition of their integrity, their dignity as persons in marriage.

I am emphasizing these developments because, as I see it, marriage and the family of the future will emerge from the resolution of the many bitter and often tragic conflicts in marriage over women's aspirations toward a new status and a new more dignified relation to man, conflicts which in many cases arise from different cultural, religious traditions of husband and wife. What will we offer in our programs of education for marriage and family living that will help individuals to recognize these basic issues, to see that what woman aspires to must be granted not only as a recognition of her human dignity but as essential to the evolution of family living appropriate to the new climate of opinion, the recently formulated concepts and new sensibilities we are developing in all areas of human relations?

Family living is crucial to the future of our social order, and unless family living can be reoriented from the older patriarchal male-dominant pattern to a new way of living, all our vaunted progress and technical improvements, our wealth and power, may be an ironic

achievement because the Nation, the people who make up our Nation and constitute our social order, will be self-defeated. The family is the basic cultural agent since parents culturize and socialize the child and by this early education prepare the child to live in our symbolic cultural world and to participate in our social order.

If we hope to make education for family living genuinely contributory we cannot limit our thinking to techniques and subject matter, to content and methods, but must try to be imaginative and creative, to envisage the goals people seek, and recognize the dynamics of culture.

We may recall here that all over the world the "cake of custom" is broken, and for the first time in their history many people are aspiring to new and better ways of living, demanding what they now know is possible as an escape from the grinding poverty, misery, chronic ills, degradation, and humiliation they have for so long endured. Industrialization is bringing not only new ways of working, with new goods and services and improved agriculture, but also revolutionary changes in family living. Thus everywhere people are confronted with much the same problems and uncertainties as we now face here in the United States. It would be ironic if other people in the so-called backward nations were able to achieve new and more desirable patterns of family living than we can because they are able, or are compelled, to renounce traditional beliefs and patterns, and so are free to create new patterns or relationships.

We are beginning to realize this in the conception of the family life cycle, which has been so well described in various formulations beginning with the White House Conferences on Family Life and further developed and refined by several writers, notably by Evelyn Millis Duval. This concept of an ever-changing family configuration is central to family life education. It is a sequence of steps and stages, of progressive transformations, which each member of the family undergoes as he or she revises, enlarges, gives up old to replace with new, patterns of behavior, relations, and feelings. How can we in our programs communicate some genuine recognition and understanding of this family life cycle, helping people to realize that only by continuous change and transformation can the family persist—that rigidity, fixation upon one pattern, and set of relations while people grow, develop, and age, must inevitably bring conflict and self-defeat in a world where nothing is fixed and unchanging?

For generations we have thought of marriage and family living as an established institution, like a room into which a man and woman entered and accommodated themselves, believing it was fixed and unchangeable and had to be endured however burdensome and even degrading. Today we are beginning to think of marriage and family living as something that has to be created and sustained by continual

striving, guided by the hopes and expectations and especially the feelings of the members of the family. And we realize that not one initial choice governs that marriage and family living, but a continual succession of choices and decisions which are made at each stage in the family life cycle and at each impact of the changing society upon the family. Like navigating a ship, family living calls for unremitting attention to the surrounding weather and to the home and family itself, with the need of all possible guides to keep the family ship on course and to surmount the various crises that may threaten family life—unemployment, desertion, divorce, accidents, premature death, unexpected and unplanned pregnancy, mental illness, chronic illness.

We have little or no well-formulated and genuinely helpful programs that recognize these crises, especially those which threaten family stability. So many families go awry when the wife is pregnant or seriously ill, when a family has to scale down its standard of living, when the husband is called away for a prolonged period. Since these are so frequent, some recognition of them and discussion of how they may be met would seem highly appropriate. A recognition of the frequency of divorce and separation and of the actions and relations that precede these would also be appropriate in a program of education for family living, but apparently many feel that they must never mention anything but normal family living and ignore the failures, mistakes, and tragic outcome of many marriages and demoralized family living.

For guidance in making these changes we have our enduring goal values which we must reformulate in terms of contemporary understanding and sensibilities. Thus we can, indeed we must, be willing to give up many of our long accepted and strongly based beliefs and codes of conduct which were formulated for an earlier way of living, expressive of goal values as understood at that time but which have now become anachronistic. Especially important is the task of developing an ethic for marriage and family living to replace the older authoritarian and moralistic pronouncements and legal concepts.

The dynamic concept that the family arises from the circular reciprocal interpersonal relations of its members also offers new insights and shows how so much of our long accepted beliefs and teachings about marriage and family living have been misleading and detrimental to the interpersonal relations which good family living requires. The recognition of normal conjugal bickering and frequent conflicts as inescapable aspects of all dynamic growing relations has made clear that the previous ideal of continuous sweetness and light, of self-sacrificing passive immolation of the wife to the demands and often bad temper of the husband, was a sham and an insult to woman's integrity as a person. The rebellion of the adolescent likewise is recog-

nized as essential to his or her growing up as an autonomous person. Family life must accordingly be reoriented from the old norms and parents must revise their expectations. But women must learn to accept the full responsibilities of their new rights and privileges.

Here we see an example of the far-reaching shift taking place in almost all areas of human thinking, marked especially in the advanced sciences, like physics, where the familiar practice has been to think in static terms, to treat events and relations as entities or like snapshots instead of seeing them as moving pictures. This way of thinking was not too irrelevant or inappropriate to a static or slowly changing culture and agricultural based social order. Today we are beginning to think in terms not of nouns but of verbs, not of entities but of processes which may produce different products depending upon where, when, and on what they operate. Thus the old notion of *the* family is being replaced by the concept of family living and a recognition of family life as an ever-changing configuration of dynamic processes.

Every marriage and every family is unique and different. Although men and women may strive for and expect what they describe in much the same conventional language, each will seek and endeavor to attain what is idiomatically peculiar to his organism-personality. Thus the old norms are to be regarded critically as the source of often tragic failure and conflicts, because they were used to coerce individuals into trying to be, and to do, what was incongruous and often unattainable for them as unique personalities with their individual heredity and life experience.

But few of us have the intelligence, the understanding, the courage to make these crucial choices and decisions today, to reorient our lives without some guidance and some helpful education. As we reject or reluctantly give up the former norms of conduct and guides to interpersonal relations, we are faced with perplexing situations we can rarely assay or evaluate adequately, especially in terms of the probable consequences of various alternative choices.

Here is where education for family living is confronted with some difficult problems, problems that cannot be resolved by research alone since these problems arise from the necessity to look forward, to consider imaginatively what can and should be done to cope with the situations we are entering. This calls for courageous and forward-looking creative planning. Especially important is to help people accept the responsibility for choosing what they want, to make up their own minds.

We have for centuries believed that for a social order, individuals must be coerced into conformity to a single set of standards, norms, patterns of behavior: that any deviations from these were threatening to social order and must be sternly repressed and punished. We have

by these principles maintained a semblance of social order, treating every deviant as a criminal or as insane to be kept under restraint or as an enemy of society to be condemned.

Today we see how this policy of enforced conformity gives rise to every form of evasive, resistant, and antisocial behavior. Can we realize that if we want a healthy social order we must try to develop healthy personalities who are not at war with society or with themselves? So much of the rebellious, destructive, self-defeating behavior arises from the effort by others to make everyone alike, or from the individual's own striving to be and to do what is not consonant with his individual capacities, life experience, and feelings. Marriage and family life suffer especially from those unhappy personalities.

Can we recognize in our tradition the long-established practice of ordering and forbidding, which depended on authority and sanctions that no longer have their once-unquestioned and unquestionable power to compel obedience? Can we now realize how individuals need practice in making decisions for themselves, for utilizing this new freedom constructively?

Education for family living, as I see it, can wisely shift from the former moralistic prescriptive role to a presentation of a more modern ethical basis, seeking not so much to impose a code or a fixed set of patterns upon everyone but to evoke his own capacity for responsible human conduct and for attaining fulfilling interpersonal relations that are productive to both personalities involved.

Can education for family living undertake to help people develop an image of family living which will be appropriate to each family, viewed as an unique constellation of highly individualized personalities? Can education for family living undertake to focus family living upon the crucial function of developing and fostering *individuality* in children, youth, and adults, seeing the family as the central agency for making operational our enduring aspirations, our beliefs in the worth of the individual personality, our cherished teaching to love little children?

Can education for family living devise ways to encourage family living as a deliberate effort to offset and compensate for the regimentation and conformity which individuals must exhibit out of the house in our social order where more and more pressure will be exercised to make people act in prescribed patterns as essential to a technological society?

How can education for family living, while helping families to cope with the successive tasks of the life cycle, do so in ways that will prepare men and women for the time when the insistent demands of children and housekeeping will be reduced and once again the man and woman must reorient themselves and set their sights ahead for a new way of living in these recently added later years of life? This is

especially significant for women who live longer and are likely to be widows.

We are told that women of today may expect to live 20 to 25 years after their youngest child leaves home. What can be done to help women to meet their family obligations during the earlier years of family life, but not lose their courage, their self-confidence, their capacity for new productive living so that they can enter fully into a post-family life with zest and courage?

Have we considered adequately what kind of housekeeping and family living might be appropriate for older men and women after the children leave and it is no longer necessary to maintain the customary practices and arrangements? What kind of family life is appropriate for families when the husband retires and usually must revise the family budget to the size of his reduced income? This often brings a financial crisis which aggravates the "retirement shock," and may lead to serious personal difficulties, especially for the wife who has to deal with a husband who is idle and bitter at life and continually at home.

How can education for family living help the increasing number of working wives to develop a way of family living that they can manage while carrying the responsibility for a job outside the home? What kind of housekeeping can be devised to reduce their labors but permit them to have the kind of family living they individually prefer?

It is relevant here to point out that those concerned with education for family living should make every effort to communicate with the architects and city planners, who for the most part have little or no awareness of the needs of families today. If the various professional schools of architecture and of city planning could be induced to give their students more orientation to family living, especially for working wives, we could make many advances. At present we are seeing families struggling with housing and housing arrangements that ignore or frustrate what families need and deserve, even in the latest designs for single family or large housing developments.

There are some more specific problems facing education for family living we should recognize briefly and discuss.

Straight didactic teaching has a place in all educational programs, but its effectiveness is decidedly limited, apart from the more purely technical information. Understandings, insights, awareness, sensibilities, have to be communicated, largely by esthetic or analogical procedures, as in pictures, novels, short stories, plays, movies, situations, and ceremonies where the individual is enabled to grasp wholes, to see meanings and relationships, to feel as well as see and think as contrasted with the usual research findings on selected variables.

I believe we may advance our educational programs by asking classes and adult groups to read and discuss short stories and novels

(now available in cheap paperback editions so each member of a group can have a copy; libraries are increasingly ready to provide sets of these for classes). We can have a group see movies (commercial movies as well as educational ones), and then discuss them, sharing their insights and learning from each other. In these discussions, individuals can discuss their own problems and perplexities in terms of the characters of the novel or play.

I personally believe that for family life educational purposes as contrasted with action programs, group dynamics, especially group discussions, are not desirable since we are not seeking consensus nor do we wish to impose a group pattern on families. And I also believe that evaluating a session at the close is undesirable because it compels individuals to evaluate an experience before they have had time to reflect on it or to discuss it with others.

More and more attention must be given in any program of education for family living to the need for counseling, since individuals need to discuss their own personal beliefs, feelings, and expectations with someone who can help them to clarify their feelings and their beliefs and help them to make their own decisions after canvassing alternatives and their consequences. An educational session often leaves an individual frustrated and confused, and insistent upon asking the group leader or teacher to give advice, which is not an appropriate function for a nonclinically trained person.

We need more and better agencies and personnel for family consultation services which will recognize not only marriage problems but the complexes of marriage, family living, homemaking, child care and rearing, the whole array of activities and relations in a family which men and women are struggling to carry on, none of which can be separated from the others.

Likewise I believe we need to recognize the many different professions which individually and usually in their own way, with no collaboration with others, are advising and trying to educate families, often producing conflicts and negating the work of others by their profession-centered advice. A list of these professions and agencies, including commercial agencies, directly in contact with families and giving advice is startling, and helps us to realize how far we are from a comprehensive view of education for family living. Is it one of the major tasks in this area to try to work out a broadly-based program for the progressive reorientation of all professional workers and agency personnel, starting with the various professional schools in the universities?

Education for family living and parent education are often carried on as separate and unrelated programs. But it seems clear that any education for family living must recognize the significance of children

in the home, the relation of parents to children, and the relation of parents to each other.

Can we hope to attain some greater measure of agreement among educators, textbook writers, writers for magazines, especially the home and so-called women's journals, newspaper columnists, etc.? I am not suggesting a policy of enforced or even voluntary uniformity, but rather some agreement to desist from the kind of out-of-date, misleading materials, programs, and advice which is being offered.

Should we plan to provide more education for family living to special groups—divorced men and women, cross-cultural marriages, stepparents, and some of the occupational and professional groups which involve serious stress in families, like physicians?

How far can we enlist the lawyer, judge, and legislator in gaining more understanding, since they are so often the major obstacles to long-overdue advances in family living as affected by legal rules and procedures, legislation, and court procedure and decisions? We still lack an adequate form of family court in most States. Can we also seek more collaboration from the clergy, many of whom are becoming interested in mental health and pastoral psychology, beginning to offer consultation service to people?

In view of the enlargement of programs of education for marriage and family living and related programs beamed at homes and schools, high schools and colleges, have we adequately evaluated what is being done in these courses and critically examined their content? Are we teaching what is genuinely relevant to contemporary social life, giving students some orientation to the new challenges and responsibilities they will soon face?

Finally, what kind of research will contribute needed materials for educational programs? Should it not be conceived in terms of the multidimensional problems presented by marriage and family living as contrasted with the professional problems of two variables favored by the separate disciplines that rarely are responsive to the needs of practitioners and teachers who must deal with the whole complex of family living? [See, L. K. Frank, "Research for What," Supplement to *Journal of Social Issues*, March 1958.]

Education for family living, as I see it, has an immense responsibility and an equally great opportunity to help us create an Individual Civilization in which we can enjoy all the marvelous products and services of science and technology, and at the same time develop a variety of designs for living through which men and women and children and youth can increasingly find fulfillment of what they have hoped for throughout the centuries and which may become attainable as we learn to live together, with respect for each other's unique individuality and with reciprocally fulfilling interpersonal relations.

A PHILOSOPHY FOR FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION *

OWEN MORGAN †

For purposes of this discussion family life education will at least initially be defined as "any planned educational experience carried out with the goal in mind of enabling people to live more effectively their family roles." Thus we may include in our scope programs at various levels. Ultimately a question may be raised as to whether it would not be feasible to broaden our definition.

In thinking through toward a basic philosophy for family life education, one of the first questions is that of whether we are most primarily interested in the family or whether there is something really more basic—some more fundamental end which the institution of the family serves. From the point of view of this paper the latter is seen as the case, although the rationale for this position may need to be carefully spelled out.

Certainly my own work, and I believe that of a significant proportion of other family life educators, is based on the assumption that "it is what happens to people that matters most." A further assumption on my part is that it is what happens to people in their significant relationships with other people which has most to do with their human fulfillment. Certainly other things are important too—productivity and creativity in work, intellectual pursuits, recreational interests, and the experiencing of self, to mention just a few of the other earthly satisfactions—but the assumption is still made here that in the final analysis it is the kind of significant relationships one has with other people that is the core of human existence for most persons. Erich Fromm contends that an individual becomes a person only through relatedness to others and that the basic condition of human existence is this relatedness.

The fundamental point in our philosophy is, then, a respect for the worth and dignity of the human personality, followed by our belief that the deepest human fulfillment comes through significant relationships with other persons. This almost automatically leads us to think of the experiences people have in their various family roles, for it is here where we find the earliest, the most prolonged, and the most

* Presented before the National Training Conference in Extension Education in Family Life, at The Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Mich., September 8, 1958.

† Family Life and Parent Education staff member, The Merrill-Palmer School.

meaningful relationships. The latter part of this point should be emphasized, for man's essential quest is seen here as for "meaningfulness" rather than just for satisfaction or happiness as such. Perhaps this is nearest to what I mean when use is made of the term "human fulfillment," i.e., the deepest meaning that life can have for the individual and an actualizing of the potential that life can have for each person. It is at least initially in family experiences where we see the greatest potential for meeting what Fromm calls the basic condition of human existence. If some other kind of social institution had the same possibility we would likely be just as interested in it, but no alternate plan such as this is in the picture so far as we know it. It is in the context of the family group that we find the greatest possibility for the meaning and the belonging which being human seems to make essential.

Traditionally much of the rationale for family life or parent education was based on our concern primarily for what happened to children as they are born into and develop within the family group. Today we are just as vitally concerned with what happens to children as we ever were, but the scope of our concern has broadened. We are now making a special point of remembering that people of all ages have the basic need for belonging, security, and for seeing themselves as counting for something—that every individual wants to and has the right to be a person in the fullest sense of the term. Parents, for example, are no longer willing—if indeed they ever have been—to see themselves as merely tools for child-rearing. At least in some circles the goals of parent education take into concern the needs of adults along with the needs of children. Ultimately this point of view may even be better for the children, for it may well be that the extent to which adults can find meaning for themselves and can have satisfying life experiences has as much as anything to do with what they can give their children psychologically. Here, we are of course not thinking of superficial satisfactions, but of the parents' needs for feelings of adequacy, security, and worth. The time has come when we realize that blaming parents for everything that happens to their youngsters is not the best approach. Too many parents have found that an approach based on fear and anxiety makes being a parent a frustrating, threatening experience. From the standpoint of this discussion the plea is for understanding and help rather than for criticism and blame. For instance, I for one have great difficulty in accepting the maxim so often heard that "there are no problem children, only problem parents." In such a statement is carried a very negative and threatening or blaming implication—one which certainly isn't aimed much toward helping and understanding. We need to avoid like the plague any approach which is primarily confidence-destroying, and to be

constantly on the alert for ways of creating the kind of atmosphere which will enable parents to sense their own potential adequacy for living their parenthood role.

The center of gravity frankly needs to be placed in the hands of parents themselves. Frequently today we hear from various sources the cry for letting parents do things in a way which is comfortable for them. With some qualifications—important ones—this fits in with the point of view of this discussion. The qualifications are that (1) we help this to be within reason and (2) we help it to be in the light of those things which we have learned about sound parent-child relationships. Certainly this calls for family life education, but it is the kind of education which helps people develop their own center of gravity in themselves rather than always looking to someone else for the answer or for approval.

While we are emphasizing a balance of emphasis on adult needs in family life education, we might wonder if perhaps one of the most effective ways of promoting mental health for both adults and their youngsters might not be doing anything we can to make for satisfying marriages. This is one of the reasons why it is so difficult to make a distinct separation between family life education and parent education, and why the two are being dealt with jointly here.

Certainly this is not the first time the question has been raised as to whether we should be child-centered, adult-centered, or both. The concept of "people-centered family" may be pertinent in any attempt to answer this question. It fits in rather nicely with our earlier assumption that we are most interested in what happens to people. Implied in this concept is the recognition that all members of a family have needs and that those needs, both met and unmet, all have a bearing on the total health of the group. Again the reference is to relatively basic needs rather than superficial ones. Another implication is that whatever happens to any family member is going to have some bearing on the other members. If Dad meets only frustration and dissatisfaction at work, the emotional climate of the family is likely to be influenced differently than if he has the opposite kind of experiences on the job. The need for Mom to have opportunities for being a *person* along with being a wife and mother is important, just as is what happens to the youngsters in school or on the playground. What we see, then, instead of just individual members with individual needs, is a network of relationships with reciprocal, and indeed multi-directional influences. Certainly no individual can have all of his needs met all of the time, and it is to be expected that the adults will have to give more than the children, but central to our people-centered approach is the realization that everyone is first of all a person and that each family member must have some consideration as such. Being

a self-respecting person is still the first criterion for being an effective family member.

The ideas presented thus far should serve to show that family life education is seen as being geared primarily to human relationships. Students in a recent college course in this field raised the question as to whether our goals are actually not broader than a concern just for *family* relationships. One student asked whether or not we would feel justified in admitting to one of our classes a person who did not at the present time have any family ties and who, for some reason just for the sake of argument, would not at a later time be a part of a family. There were varying opinions and ideas. For a little while we tried to decide what other labels might be used, with someone suggesting the title "human relations." Another student felt that this was confusing because this term is often used in the context of intergroup relationships. Another student suggested that really what we had been talking about most of the time centered around "personal relationships" and that this might be an appropriate title for a course. Certainly it is presumed that attaining the goals we see for our family life education programs will mean a carryover into areas other than just family living, but with this clearly in mind, it is perhaps best to keep our focus primarily on the realm of family living. Especially is this true for such a professional group as you extension specialists, for you are working largely in the context of existing families. As a total group of professional people though, it is important for us to keep in mind our regard for the human personality regardless of any particular person's family status. As an illustration of this point, it is hoped that we would be just as interested in making it possible for an adult single person to find what we have referred to as "human fulfillment" as someone who was married and had a family. This is just another way of saying that it is what happens to *people* which concerns us most.

For a group of family life and parent education specialists such as this there is likely very little of anything new in this thinking. Rather it represents something of a reaffirmation and a restatement of philosophy for most of you. Other professional groups might find it a great deal less familiar. Perhaps one of our tasks is to find ways of making people in all walks of life more aware of basic human values, i.e., the things which we who work closely with human needs and hopes and feelings consider of basic importance in our living together. It is important too that we continue to be aware of the assumptions upon which we base our efforts, and that we carry out and support research efforts which test our assumptions. Being constantly in search of data which will spell out the difference between what I often call "conjectural thinking" and scientific knowledge, and being willing to re-

vise our thinking when the evidence calls for this is a challenge we must carry with us. Oftentimes we do operate on the basis of hypotheses, and we will continue to do this. I hope that we will at least be cognizant of this fact and that we will be willing to submit our assumptions to the test of sound research.

One of our major questions is what to do about values. If the philosophy presented here is to serve as the rationale for family life education, we are committed unequivocally to one value—that of the inherent dignity and worth of the human personality, with a corollary belief in the crucial significance of interpersonal relationships. Frankly, I feel that one of our tasks is to work toward the ordering or reordering of the hierarchy of values, both societally and individually, in line with this basic tenet. I have sometimes, for example, encountered students in our own field who had been taught that the important thing was the kind of a house people lived in or that the color scheme was in good taste. Without detracting from homemaking skills which help create attractive physical surroundings or from skills which make for gracious living, these need to be seen in proper perspective and not without considering their relevance to relationships between the people in the family. Like the story about the young daughter in an army family experiencing difficulty in finding housing. When an adult friend said, "My isn't it too bad you can't find a home," she replied, "Oh, we have a home; we just don't have any place to put it."

What has been presented here is one point of view regarding the rationale for family life education. It would be naïve to think that there are not others to be considered. These ideas are presented in the hope that they will serve as the starting point for a discussion of others which will help us as a group to consider some of the premises behind our professional endeavors.

NEW TRENDS IN FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION *

RICHARD KERCKHOFF †

First, let me say that I interpret "new trends" to mean the large directions and dynamics which are affecting the family life education movement, and not to refer to the comparatively less significant techniques and gimmicks which are used in the field such as brainstorming, role-playing, TV, etc.

Before launching our discussion of these new trends in family life education, I should like to spend about three minutes on three related introductory topics, namely, impertinence, temptation and sin.

It smacks of impertinence for me, speaking from what one of my students called my ivy tower, to tell you who are fresh from the actual field of battle, what is new in this campaign. However, this sharing of perceptions from various individuals' distorted points of view is what makes a conference workshop, and so I offer no apology for impertinence.

As for the other two introductory topics, temptation and sin, let me just say that given a receptive audience and a limited knowledge of what *are* the true trends in a large field like family life education, the temptation is to pack my presentation with my personal views of what *should* be happening to the field. And if it turns out that my presentation consists of this and this alone, I'd call that sinful. For the present, I choose to give in to the temptation (that is, to give you some of my personal views), but to avoid the sin (that is, hopefully to give you something *more* than just my personal views). However, giving in to temptation without sinning is obviously a difficult task.

Now for the main part of this discussion. I have surveyed the literature and my memory in a very unscientific manner and have found when most people discuss the new trends in a field—at least when they discuss them before an audience of partisans or fans—they say a lot of nice things about the field, that is, they list nice trends. I propose today to be nice, but also to be nasty.

One of the nastiest ways to approach the subject of new trends in family life education is to recall what were the new trends 20 years ago and simply repeat them today. Actually, this is done in all in-

* Presented before The National Training Conference in Extension Education in Family Life, at The Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, September 9, 1958.

† Sociologist, The Merrill-Palmer School.

nocence in many current lists of "new trends." Some of the aspects of the family life field which have been traditionally and repeatedly regarded as new trends are, as far as I can determine, as follows:

1. The increased use of techniques of teaching by family life teachers which are, compared with traditional techniques, more student-centered, informal, more reliant on sharing of student-experience and less on lecture and the conveying of teacher-knowledge, more "functional," and, by definition, less traditional.
2. Increased activity by researchers in areas useful to family life educators and increased use of this research by those educators.
3. The extension of the happy combination of personal counseling with classroom teaching and the greater use of group therapy in conjunction with more strictly educational approaches.
4. The growth of the family life education field itself, as measured by the larger number of courses offered, budgets appropriated, teachers hired, etc.
5. The growth of the family life educators themselves, as measured by their increased professionalization, that is, by journals published (and presumably read), studies made, in-service training programs held, professional organizations joined, etc.
6. Shifts and changes, clarifications and improvements in the philosophy and goals of family life education.

I am sure that these are not the only new trends in family life education which have been noted in the past and are currently being listed by authors and speechmakers, but they strike me as being the ones most often mentioned. They are, you will probably agree, worthy trends, for the most part, and ones which should encourage us practitioners and make us proud of our field. The only trouble is that these trends are *not* new, and my suspicion is that they may not even be trends.

It is easy to document the fact that years ago family life educators thought these things were new trends in their day. And happily, most of us can attest that these things really happened in our field. That is, family life teachers *were* among the first in many areas to make widespread and effective use of various new student-centered teaching techniques; they *did* encourage and use certain researches; they *did* make exciting combinations of educational and psychotherapeutic skills; they *did* work hard to clean up the philosophy and goals of family life education and to become more professional; and the field *did* spread and become more popular.

However, these are no longer *new* trends—they were new to the field *yesterday*, not *today*. And although some of them may continue to be trends today, it is possible that they may not. My own observa-

tions on this last point are mixed. That is, I find some family life educators moving in these directions, but many are not—many are *less* creative in their teaching, less student-centered, less apt to counsel as well as teach, less knowledgeable about research, and less clear about their philosophy and goals than are teachers in *other* fields. And certainly there is a lot of doubt that the field of family life education, in the *schools* anyhow, is actually growing today—it may do well to hold its own in tomorrow's curriculum.

My personal view is that in its own modest manner family life education has been a revolution or mass movement in the educational world and that it has now lost its revolutionary force. And that is the major new trend I have to report today. We have left the heady, happy days in which family education was accepted uncritically and enthusiastically by a small group of hard core true believers and given at least passive acceptance and a pale green light by a bewildered set of administrators and taxpayers who thought *something* should be done for the poor American family. This is a new phase, a less dramatic but probably far more important phase for any new idea or mass movement. Family life education is no longer a youthful, dynamic, pioneering, rapidly-changing field. I doubt, in fact, if family life education is changing as rapidly even as is the American family. Now, in this new phase, the field must produce real stuff—education and proof that it educates. Now the gains of the past must be consolidated without the field becoming as rigid and dull as those it crowded out of the curriculum. By and large, revolutions fail not because of a lack of original enthusiasm, but because in their second-phase—the consolidation and solid improvement phase—they have nothing to replace the original enthusiasm with, or because they replace it with pure rigidity and reaction.

And it is this latter eventuality that strikes me as being a definite possibility and probably a new trend in family life education today. That is, it seems to me that the field is becoming *over-consolidated*, over-institutionalized, rigid and reactionary. There seems to be a general impression among family educators that this is no time to go too far with any idea—this is no time to challenge the folkways. Instead, this seems to me to be the get-along-with time; get along with those who oppose sex education, progressive education, functional education, or just education. Get along with those who are shocked by new ideas concerning chastity, birth control, and abortion. Get along with those who want to send the children back to the woodshed and father back to his throne.

I'll ignore for the present the fact that our society as a whole seems to be in a difficult reactionary phase, and that other educators, not just family life educators, are often afraid to offer anything but

warmed-up tried and true party line gospel. Ignoring this (unrealistically), I'll turn to some of the elements which seem to me to be contributing to the trend toward stuffiness and reaction in the family life education field itself.

Today, in the *academic* world, family life education is dominated by home economics and sociology, two fields which, along with the good which might be said about them, must be admitted to be almost competing with each other in demonstrations of insecurity and conservatism. Both disciplines have profited materially from their relationship with family life education and both have been treating it like a poor relative. One of the outcomes of this unhealthy relationship seems to me to be the placing of a lid on the enthusiasm of family life educators from these two disciplines; these educators don't want to appear any odder than they already appear to their academic peers. I should mention that the addition of psychologists to the field has in no way improved this situation.

Another major contributor to conservatism within the family life field, I believe, has been the role of the National Council on Family Relations. This is supposed to be the professional organization of the family educator. It is a pleasant enough group of people and has played an important part in the movement we are discussing. However, it is *not* really a professional organization and it has been dominated (at least until recently) by conservative elements both in its leadership and its membership. Unless it undergoes radical change it isn't likely to come up with any more new ideas in the next 20 years than it has in the past 20. And unless it comes up with some new ideas for providing leadership in the family education field, its effect on American family life will continue to be modest. At any NCFR meeting, one can hear speeches more appropriate to a bygone day and the impression I get is that the speakers still believe that family education is a radical idea and that the main problem facing the profession is one of childhood disease rather than of premature senility. There is, however, some room for optimism; at least the leadership of the NCFR seems to be improving and one hears a new rustling in the leaves.

The publications in the field of family education also may be contributing to its ossification. Certainly recent editors of *Marriage and Family Living* have made that journal more respectable and useful. Several books have been published in the family education field which are worth reading, although not truly exciting. But it is in the area of textbooks that the real weakness seems to lie. After so few years of publication of texts in the field, we are already making them fit a formula; they all resemble each other both in what they include and in the rather major family topics they won't touch. Not that they are, when considered individually, bad books. (Although some, particularly some for high school use, are vile.) But they are too obviously proof

of the stereotypic and reactionary quality of the educators who are using them.

Mostly, however, I would not point to the nature of the text books, the insecurity and declassé position of the educators, and the ineffectual leadership of the NCFR as main causes of the fact that family life education has lost its revolutionary excitement. Along with the aforementioned fact that this is just generally not the time for revolutionary excitement in our society, I would point to the character of the revolution itself that family life education experienced. That is, we should note that by and large this was revolution from the Right—it was not a revolution designed to change the family in a new and idealistic manner, but to preserve the family, and, in fact, to restore the family to a form in which it was supposed to have existed in some happier former day. Obviously, this revolution of reaction was not what such pioneers as Burgess, Waller and Folsom had in mind; they seem to have thought that a new day for liberal, humanistic, individualistic and rationalistic family relationships rooted in the democratic ethic was in sight. But their influence, enormous as it was, did not send the family life movement in that direction. Instead, those who jumped onto the bandwagon later influenced it in their own direction—that is, toward more conservative, more traditional, more socially-acceptable goals. In this sense, then, the present period of inaction and reaction in family life education is simply the logical outcome, and even success, of revolution from the Right.

Now all this may sound like more impertinence and personal bias—and it probably is. Certainly there are more optimistic trends that can be reported in the field of family life education. The attempt to enunciate clear philosophy and goals and the attempt to measure outcome of family education have both been accelerated by Sputniks and by the need to *sell* our field in an educational market that is filled with new consumer resistance. At times I even think family life education is reaching the place where conferences will give equal time to discussions of philosophy and of techniques instead of putting such emphasis on methods and techniques without consideration of what the methods and techniques are supposed to produce. And in my opinion a major task facing family educators today remains that of thinking out our goals and philosophy.

Also, at times I think I recognize a new trend toward greater awareness of and respect for the values of the people with whom we work—our clients and students. This includes a recognition of individual differences and of group differences (such as social class, ethnic and religious differences).

I should like to list most briefly other probable or at least hopeful trends under the heading of "balance"—balance between preaching a *laissez faire* permissiveness and an authoritarian back-to-the-woodshed

approach; balance between child-centered and adult-centered homes, leading to people-centered homes; balance between ignoring the importance of single factors in influencing human behavior and going overboard on single-causation theories such as early toilet training, breast-feeding, etc. And balance in the role of the family life expert—so that today perhaps he can be expert in his subject without apology but also without assuming that his client or student is or should be dependent upon him.

And despite my rather gloomy picture of the troubles besetting family life education at the moment, it is important to note that it is still the field in which we choose to work, and we believe in it. It is still the field in which education is most functional and helpful—in which people are touched personally by education. It is a field which draws good people into it, a field with big problems, high ideals, and a continual temptation to settle for less than the best. It is the field which deals with the most vital subject of human beings in their closest relationships with each other. It was Ralph Linton, the anthropologist, who put the importance of our subject matter most truly in perspective for me:

A congenial marriage can provide more contentment and emotional security than any other human relationship, and in a world in flux these are becoming increasingly important to individual happiness. A union which provides them no formal sanctions or external pressures to insure its continuity. The ancient trinity of father, mother, and child has survived more vicissitudes than any other human relationship. It is the bedrock underlying all other family structures . . . In the *Götterdämmerung* which over-wise science and over-foolish statesmanship are preparing for us, the last man will spend his last hours searching for his wife and child. [Linton, Ralph, *The Natural History of the Family*. In: *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. p. 38. Ruth Nanda Anshen, Ed., Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949.]

Finally, I should like to say that these trends, if I have noted them at all correctly, call for certain action on *our* part. They encourage me to encourage all of us to keep alive and experimental in our approach to family life education; we must not accept any popular stereotype of family education or family life—be it the stereotype of the text books, the researcher, the advertisements or the well-fed middle-class. We must, instead, keep close to the people with whom we work, learning more about their goals while working harder at analyzing our own. The Extension Service, with its philosophy of working with people for their own good, of combining all methods of teaching with all means of research and service, is perhaps more admirably suited to show the way toward a more dynamic and functional family life education than is any other branch of the field today.

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN FAMILY LIFE AND PARENT EDUCATION *

IRVING SIGEL †

In this era of science and technology, the use of scientific procedures has been applied to problems facing man in all fields of endeavor. Today man no longer is sacrosanct and beyond the pale of scientific analysis and measurement. The underlying belief among social scientists is that the use of science can contribute to the understanding, and in the long run the betterment, of man.

Scientific methods and procedures have been, are being, and no doubt will continue to be applied to the study of various kinds of human problems. The hope is that by such investigations we will be able to understand more clearly what accounts for the behavior of people. More important, perhaps, we hope that this kind of information will enable us to understand the requirements for modification of human behavior.

As soon as we begin to talk, however, about understanding man and modification of his behavior, we run head-on into some extremely controversial issues. The major issue that is relevant to your work is that of right and responsibility to influence other's behavior deliberately. On what grounds, we may be asked, do we elect to change people's behavior? In what direction do we elect to change people's behavior? For example, if the parent educator observes that the parent is doing "everything wrong" and that the child, from all that we know now, will inevitably become maladjusted, does the educator have the right to attempt to change the parent's behavior if the parent does not wish to do so? Facing us immediately is the issue of the freedom of the individual to act in ways that he elects.

In other fields such as medicine and public health we find that the state and the physician can, on various types of occasions, intercede when it is noted that the parent or the individual is behaving in a manner detrimental to the public good. Thus, schools require children to be vaccinated and parents do not, in most cases, feel this is an infringement on their rights. When we move into the fields of interpersonal relationships, however, the problem is considerably magnified.

* Presented before The National Training Conference in Extension Education in Family Life, at The Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, September 9, 1958.

† Chairman, Research Area, The Merrill-Palmer School.

My purpose here, however, is not to offer a solution to this particular issue, although I believe this issue is one of the main factors underlying your entire activity as family life and parent educators. *You* must resolve the problem of where, and under what conditions, parent educators can, or should, interfere or attempt to interfere in the lives of the people with whom they work.

I raise this issue because it is particularly relevant to the role of research. After all, research is an investigatory procedure aimed at establishing facts and general laws of human behavior. Among the facts we are interested in, for example, are those which will account for the kinds of behavior we see in children. Thus, one important area that parent educators and family life specialists have been interested in has been parent-child relationships. The facts that emerge from such research usually refer to the effect of certain parental practices on the developing child. What do we then do with this information? How are we going to use it? What kinds, if any, of influence techniques would be used to get parents to modify their practices in accord with research findings?

You, as an interpreter and consumer of research, must face this problem more than the doer of research. We research workers can achieve our results by studying a particular question, publishing the findings in our journals, receiving the accolades that come with long publication lists, and rest on our laurels, with the usual final statement in our publications, "more research is necessary". So we continue to do the "more research" and feel that we are contributing to man's knowledge of man. Meritorious as these studies are, however, if the results reside in libraries and are topics of conversation solely of professional in-groups, so to speak, to what end is this research? My own conviction is that research findings are of value and merit translation into action. To move from this point of view is to ask the questions: Who is to consume the research? How is it to be used? What is the responsibility of the research worker? What is the responsibility of the consumer?

Let us look at a research activity and find just what is involved. Research is a problem-solving activity. The researcher encounters a problem that fascinates him and attempts to find the answer. The process of investigation is no different essentially whether it is done by a physicist, a psychologist, a historian, or an engineer. The overall aim is basically the same, the discovery of facts to provide bases for general laws.

In the natural and biological sciences, however, in which longer traditions of scientific investigation exist and the problems studied are impersonal, there are fewer complexities in interpretation and applica-

tion. Of course, it is true that in the 19th century when people like Darwin and Pasteur offered their theories and their experiments tremendous resistance was aroused, especially on religious grounds but also on the grounds of tradition. Today, these are not issues that are likely to occur in biology and the natural sciences. In contrast, issues of values, opinions, religion, and over all cultural orientation tend to manifest themselves with intensity in the study of human behavior. After all, it is very difficult in this day of relativism to establish what is good and what is bad. We always ask ourselves the questions: Good for what? Bad for what? Is it bad to be neurotic? Is it necessary that people be happy? Such questions are overlaid with tremendous values and emotionality.

If this is the case, then, we are faced with the immediate problem in research on human behavior of what problems we are to study. Some research workers are theoretically minded and tend to work on theoretical models in studying human behavior. Whether there is any practical application from such research now or in the future is not the crucial point. The important thing is to discover laws of human behavior to better understand it. Some research workers specializing in the fields of learning admit that the applicability of some of the laws to human learning is not yet known—although this is to come in time. But such application is not necessarily of interest or concern to them. The person who is to apply them has the problem of determining how the findings can be used. The point of view, which is not problem oriented but tends to be theoretically oriented, is in the best traditions of scientific investigation. Traditionally the scientist has not been concerned with the applicability, but has been concerned with some of the basic questions regarding various types of phenomena.

Another type of research might be called "problem centered" research. Here particular problems require answers at once and research workers move to find these answers. This kind of research is employed in industry, in the physical and natural sciences and in engineering, as well as in the social sciences. Some people refer to it as technological; not basic, but, applied. Whatever term we give it, whether it is one of approval or condescension, the fact remains that people engaged in such activity are doing research. The problems that are studied in the social sphere, for example, are problems like delinquency, problems involved in education, etc. The research worker elects to study a problem because of his own social conscience, because of certain institutional requirements, or for some other reason. In any event, research in this area frequently has the primary aim of attempting to solve particular problems with some degree of dispatch.

Admittedly these two classifications of research are arbitrary. Nevertheless, I think they point to some real differences from the consumer's point of view. The consumer of research, be he the teacher or the clinician or the man on the street, looks to research workers in various fields for certain kinds of answers. When he looks to theoretically oriented research, he finds there are many steps between the research findings and their application. He finds the language, the theoretical models presented, very difficult to apply to his everyday experience. When he looks at some of the applied research, however, sometimes the task is much easier: for instance, in Situation "A", if the results show Condition "B", then certain recommendations for practical action can be made. Let me illustrate this, using our own research.

In our study of parental behavior, we have found that parents who tend to assert power blatantly in controlling their children, seem to have children who show hostility toward their peers in the nursery school. Taking this bit of information as a fact for the present, it may seem easy to point out to parents: "If you want your children to show hostility toward their peers, assert your power when you want to modify their behavior. If, on the other hand, you want to prevent such hostility in your child, then avoid using such behavior and try to use other kinds." In other words, there are fewer interpretive steps between direct application of the research finding and the recommendation to parents outside the research situation.

Before we do this, however, we are faced with some questions. If the consumers of the research are practitioners like yourselves, then it seems that you have a certain responsibility to be able to comprehend the material that is read and to evaluate it accordingly. It would appear to me that you, the consumers of research, would be the group to whom many research studies are relevant. You come to these studies as people of experience, and in an applied and practical set of situations. You also come to them frequently with little, if any, communication (other than the printed page) with the research worker. You come to them not necessarily trained in research evaluation. And yet you are expected to be able to read, to evaluate, and to apply what you learn to your daily work.

It strikes me as a strange and peculiar phenomenon that this is so. I would think that a cardinal part of your education should be opportunities to learn how to assess and to evaluate research studies. In fact, from my jaundiced point of view and no doubt as part of my own vested interest, such training is essential in *all* applied fields. This becomes so particularly in the social sciences where many complex factors must be weighed in assessing the relevance of research. For example by contrast, in medicine when the Salk vaccine was put on

the market, the doctor did not need to know much about the life history, attitudes, and psychology of the patient when he asked him to turn around, bend over, and have his "shot". Human bodies have greater similarity than have human personalities, perhaps. Consequently, this shot could be given to children in Florida, Maine, or California and the predictions would be much alike: the chances would be that the child would not get polio. However, with a psychological fact, the applicability is not so simple.

Let us for the moment return to the psychological fact that if a parent tends to show a high incidence of dominant, controlling behavior, which is arbitrary and does not take the child's needs into consideration, the child will demonstrate hostility toward his peer groups in a nursery school setting. Now, the first question may be:

What population was used in the study? The answer must be that 22 families from two different class groups were studied. Then, you may ask, if only 22, were these representative of the whole or is this just a unique finding for this particular group? Further, does this happen with every child for whom such relationships could be established, or is it just a question of probability? Finally, you may ask: Well, does this hold true for children younger, or older, of a different racial or ethnic background, or different cultural background? All of these questions are relevant and to the point. If we answered that our findings could apply *only* to the group studied we would have no basis for generalizing, therefore to what end the research? By now the particular group upon which the research was done is not the same, since the children have gotten older and consequently the parents, the family constellation, has all changed. Another question the reader must ask is what assumptions underlie the study. What, for example, determines the relevance of the problem, what is its significance, what assumptions are made regarding human behavior. This is a complex series of questions which are important.

Seemingly, this points to an impasse, doesn't it? It suggests that generalization from social science research is highly limited and therefore we are faced with the problem of deciding whether we can use such information. Or, we might say we can only use such information if we get it quickly enough and can apply it. However, the situation is not as desperate as I intentionally pictured it. The reason is that certain rules of scientific procedure have been followed which allow for greater generalizing than might be indicated. In the study mentioned and the facts presented, this was a prediction in advance of the findings. In other words, we set up a hypothesis based on our knowledge of human behavior, of parent-child interrelationships, and made a prediction that stated: the correlation between power assertion and hostility expression toward peers as compared to teachers

will be positive. An elaborate explanation of this hypothesis was drawn and we proceeded to test it independently on the data obtained. The only way that we could ascertain the objectivity of our findings was to quantify them, that is, by the use of statistical procedures we were able to handle the possibility of our own bias. After all, involved in such research is our own ego. We want to show that we can predict correctly. Therefore, when one wants to read material clinically, it becomes relatively easier to show what one wants to show than by statistics. In fact, I think the old adage that "statistics can show you what you want them to show" is more readily applied to impressionistic and clinical evidence than to statistical evidence.

In the illustration I gave we found positive and significant correlations. That is, we found the correlations were those that would occur beyond chance. Therefore, if we repeat this experiment, or study, the chances are that we would find the same kinds of relationships with populations of the same type. This being so we can feel more comfortable about generalizing since we are doing so on legitimate scientific grounds. In other words, we could say that our sample of parents has characteristics which are, in a way, representative of the kind of parents who send their children to nursery school, middle and lower socio-economic groups; and, though the number is small, the correlation is of such significance that we can have confidence in the finding. This is *particularly* the case since we were able to predict such a finding in advance, otherwise one could say the finding was spurious, or chance. Did we just get a significant correlation because, out of the thousands of correlations that were run, chances are we could get some that were significant? Further, we would have to explain the reason for the correlation; and again, this means we can always explain things easier after the fact than before the fact.

Does this finding, however, mean that every child coming from a highly power-assertive home shows identical behavior? The answer is no, since all our predictions are based on probabilities. That is, the chances are that the relationship will hold, but the prediction is not perfect. There are sources of "error" in every experiment. These "errors", as we call them, (not to be confused with mistakes) are inherent in current theory and methodology—i.e., the place of unknown factors that are possibly operative.

Does this mean we are to place little confidence in the results? The answer again is *no*. What we can say is that the relationships are much better than chance and therefore the probability is very good (depending on the statistical findings) that the obtained relationship holds.

I should say right here that this is identical to the predictions in all science. With Salk vaccine predictions also are in terms of proba-

bilities; the chances are that people inoculated will not get polio. It is perhaps difficult to accept the "probabilistic" concept, since our preference is for certainty. Perhaps we had better get to accept it, since we certainly live with it in all phases of our life—note actuarial tables and automobile accident predictions.

Thus, confidence in our finding is based on (1) the fact that we predicted the obtained relationship in advance; and (2) that the obtained relationship was found to be statistically significant. But predictions must be made on the basis of probability.

This illustration, I think, indicates that confidence in statistical results will depend on whether the predictions made, appeared before the statistical analysis. What confidence, on the other hand, are we to place in studies which do not present hypotheses which were made before the fact? Here we must be extremely careful. We can only say that findings elicited from such research are suggestive and tentative, and cannot be established as fact unless the study is repeated and the results occur as in the original study. Unfortunately, in our field relatively little replication of studies is done. This is a serious but understandable problem. After all, so many problems remain to be tackled that some people feel there is not time to actually repeat studies. From my own point of view, however, it would seem that work for masters' theses, for example, frequently might replicate some of the results.

At any rate, it seems we can safely generalize that where sheer empiricism has been used, i.e., going in, measuring, analyzing, etc., the results are tenuous and tentative. This is so regardless of the sophistication or the elaboration of the statistics. The fact that these things occur does not necessarily mean these *are* predictive and lawful findings, unless replicated on an independent sample.

Another problem is: how are we going to use non-statistical studies in our thinking? Case reports, clinical material, psychiatric interviews, group discussion impressions and the like are frequently found in the literature. These are very rich and rewarding. Many insights can be obtained from reading such literature and the value of this material cannot be underestimated. But here we are particularly dependent on a number of factors before we can adequately assess the material. Clinical material, of whatever kind, or impressionistic material, comes through the eyes of the observer. There is no external check on the validity or reliability of his observation. That is, there is no external check on whether he actually saw what he reports, or that he is consistent in seeing what he reports.

All of you have, no doubt, experienced a situation in which you have accompanied one other person to interview a group or a family. As you walk away, one of you might observe "How relaxed and com-

fortable these people seemed!" whereas the other might remark "Gee, weren't they tense and uncomfortable?" Which was correct? Each of you could legitimately present evidence to support your position. Each, no doubt, could write an elaborate article on the implications of this particular situation, using as the evidence your own observations. Certainly these would seem highly limited data by which to generalize and hence have only restricted kinds of use. The use such information does have is to sharpen our insights and help us think through questions which can then be formulated into more objective research studies. After all, the aim of the scientific approach to studies is to examine a problem with maximum safeguards against personal biases of investigators. Impressionistic studies therefore, could only be assessed as providing useful hypotheses. Here you, the consumer, now is placed on the spot when reading some of these materials. You have to assess their utility and their validity in relationship to your own actual work experience. Occasionally you might try some of the ideas suggested. If you do, you should do it while you carefully take stock of the situation. You are actually doing a research job—an evaluative one.

In either instance, then, the study must be evaluated by specific kinds of criteria. Since we must be so careful and there is so much to be done, how are we going to operate at this point? I think here we are all placed in a position such as the physician must face when a patient comes to him suffering from a disease that the doctor, from his own knowledge, knows to be incurable. His only knowledge extends to diagnosis and palliative treatment—crude, no doubt—but applied because it is the best he can do. In certain ways we are operating in somewhat the same situation, although we actually know much more than we might think.

We know that human behavior is influenced by a variety of factors. This multi-determination of behavior means that various kinds of things are interacting at the same time to effect certain types of behaviors. We know, quite convincingly, that human behavior comes from both conscious and unconscious sources. We know too that people change in varying degrees; and that they hold ideas and opinions which are both reality based and not reality based. We know that it is more difficult to change a person's point of view if it is highly emotionalized rather than quite rational. In other words, we know much about people and about our interacting and dealing with people. However, we do not know as much about the impact of certain kinds of behavior, particularly parent behavior, on children. We have conflicting evidence of the effect of toilet training, early and late, of various types of feeding, and of different kinds of discipline.

One word of caution about social science findings: living in an

era of change, of new kinds of technological and social conditions emerging with tremendous rapidity, as well as values being shifted and re-examined periodically, some of the findings that we have, at certain points in time, must be reassessed in terms of current conditions. This is always a problem in a society which constantly is in a state of change. I don't mean upheaval. I don't mean revolutionary changes. I mean a society which is dynamic, living, and active. This is an important thing to remember when looking over the literature presented during the past few years.

Thus, the consumer, the practitioner like yourself, must constantly be aware of the changes, trends and attitudes, that occur among the population with which he is dealing. The degree of change will vary from area to area. No doubt, in relatively isolated areas, in rural communities, a change may be less dramatic than in large, urban centers. Nevertheless, with the mass communication techniques of today there seems to be every reason to expect change to permeate all facets of our complex society.

To return to the knowledge we have regarding parent-child behavior, in particular, I would like to add that parent-child behavior must be put into a social-psychological context. Therefore, the fields that are important in their contribution toward an understanding of parent-child relationships are those such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology. A close look shows that we are dealing with an applied problem which has its roots in many disciplines. This means, then, that we must—in our reading and in our thinking—dip into the various fields which are relevant and integrate a lot of them for our particular purposes. This workshop, to me, exemplifies a kind of professional activity of considerable importance. People from different parts of the country, who face different problems around the same general area, *must* get together not only to talk about their kinds of experiences but also to discuss new things.

Does this, not then, make it impossible for you, the consumer, to recommend child-rearing practices when we are in a rather "spongy" area? Again we are faced with the question I raised at the beginning. What one recommends to parents is only not determined by the actual knowledge we have obtained; it is based on the underlying belief that we can and should modify the behavior of others, that we are in a position to suggest changes deemed important and necessary, and that the changes recommended to parents are desirable because we have worked out a criterion of what is desirable child-rearing. This knowledge does not come solely from the facts of research. For example, do we take the position that children should not be stimulated and motivated toward intellectual achievement? Research has pointed out the anxiety created in children around problems of

achievement. Do we feel that this anxiety must be eliminated? Do we feel this anxiety must be maintained? Do we believe that a little anxiety and discomfort is all right? After all, if you take a Calvinistic position here, one comes up with the idea that, in life, we should not expect to "live on a bed of roses", that life involves work and struggle in the process of self-development. However, one can also say "life is short, so let's make it as easy and pleasant as possible"; therefore, don't push your kid, he'll get along more or less. These are not questions that the research worker can answer from his studies. The facts point to relationships between certain phenomena. The research points to the consequences of certain practices. But whether these practices should be maintained is another question, one which I believe the research worker is not peculiarly competent or qualified to answer. He can only point out what the probable results will be.

For example, if we discover that infants who are breast fed are for a long time dependent and demanding, do we then say to a parent, "Stop breast feeding because your child will become dependent"? Or do we say: "Look, if you want to continue breast feeding your child, the chances are that your child will become a highly dependent individual," and the parent is left then to make the choice? Here we are facing the question of social responsibility and the degree to which we wish to allow the parent self-selection in terms of child rearing practice.

If we take this position of self-selection by presenting the facts to the parent, all we can do then is point out that, as far as we know now, these are the facts. *You* must make the decision as to what to do. This is very different from taking a position of advocating particular kinds of parental practices. This is very different from attempting to alter the parent's practices by manipulation, coercion, or any other kind of pressure. It seems to me that the practitioner must resolve this issue.

However, resolution of this conflict, if there be one in the minds of practitioners, must be done in cooperation with research workers. The research worker, I believe, has a responsibility to state the conditions, ramifications, and implications of his work. Frequently, such discussions are found in research literature, but not generally. Perhaps this is a place where research workers and practitioners must join hands and work together for the mutual benefit of the public because specific research findings often are interwoven with other facts and theories.

In his educational activities the practitioner (whether he presents the facts discovered through research and takes the position of advocating them or "letting the chips fall where they may"), encounters a particularly challenging practical problem. Parents may state, from

their own experience, that what they have done contradicts the reports in the research literature. For example, one parent says: "I treat all my children alike, yet Johnny is different from Jimmy." Or a parent may say "I spank my child regularly and he has turned out all right." The generalizations parents make from this is that what they have done and what they plan to do is perfectly all right, regardless of what some "high falutin" research workers have discovered. It seems that the practitioner here should be aware of a number of things that are relevant to this particular question. First, we know that people are reluctant to admit they are wrong. Second, we know that people tend to—have to, in many ways—enhance their own security in their behavior by sticking to what they have done. We must remember that frequently the parents we are working with have children of varying ages and that what they have done is in the past and cannot be rectified. Consequently, we might expect more defensiveness in admitting error or a particular kind of practice that is not generally acceptable. Also, we must not forget that parents have different expectations and values. Therefore, in their scheme of things, their view of human nature, and their responsibility as parents, a particular practice may seem completely logical and rational or at any rate defensible.

In a way we are faced here with the same kind of issue that can be seen in political action, between conservatism and liberalism, or between traditionalism and progressive change. After all, a parent may say: "I was beat as a child and look how good I am" and, "If it was good enough for me it is good enough for my children."

Also here we have the question of how much can we undermine the parent's confidence in his own practices. In other words, when we face the problem of the parent using his own experiences as a basis for making generalizations, we must take into account what we know about the psychology of the adult. We also must know about the use of defenses, when people rationalize, or project, or in some way tend to cope with conflict through various mental mechanisms.

Where then does all this lead to in terms of you, the practitioner? Are you to be scientists, working with parents from a scientific point of view, or are you to be catalysts which enables you to merely spark ideas in parents by presenting them with research facts or figures? Or are you to primarily be an observer who, in a sense, sets the stage and lets things go where they will? I have made this point, perhaps, too often in this talk. The question is one that I still feel you people have to resolve.

In summary, I would like to make the following points: (1) A research orientation requires a certain type of point of view, one of asking questions, looking for answers, being aware of the limitations upon which one can generalize and the requirements for generalization

(2) A belief is necessary that you and research workers have a mutual responsibility for greater inter-communication at levels which are comprehensible to both the practitioner and the research worker. This means that some mechanism must be found by professional practitioners to work out arrangements with relevant professional people for the kinds of interaction which are of mutual benefit, particularly around the entire area of interpreting research findings to the general public (3) The practitioner has a responsibility, through his professional organizations, to make every effort to spark research in areas which he sees as highly important for effective conduct of his kinds of program. Hopefully, through more interaction and more support of research in the field, some questions can be answered within the reasonable future (4) Research training in courses like evaluation of the literature is a "must" for all practitioners. After all, the kinds of facts that you present to the public are based on your reading and your interpretation. The relevance of these facts to the particular people involved is something you must be able to assess. This can be done only when one knows the requirements for assessing a research study.

Further, research, in my opinion, underpins practical activity in the areas of education. New methods, new procedures, new facts, can only be presented to the public when the interpreter (a) has access to these facts and (b) is able to make an adequate interpretation and application. Only by such procedure can we actually "feed into" the applied field the findings of many research studies and in such application lies their great social utility.

Workshops of this kind are very important, but it seems to me that workshops should also be established in an effort to pull together research literature and to assess its relevance to the public. After all, many of our studies and facts come from middle-class populations and care is necessary in how we interpret these to other social-economic groups.

I would like to make one final plea: that practitioners like yourselves, who are probably in areas close to universities and other such centers, should perhaps assume some responsibility in trying to initiate help from research workers in these places and operate more closely with them, whenever possible. I think that research work and the work of the practitioner go hand-in-glove. It will require both to make any effective parent education program socially valuable. Otherwise, if we ignore research findings as the fundamental basis for our practice, we are ignoring fact and operating from highly individualized and unsubstantiated opinion. This is *not* education.

THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF DEVELOPMENT

BYRON O. HUGHES *

Recent work in the general fields of biology, biochemistry, and biophysics has established that there is no definite boundary between living and non-living systems. In one framework of environment a protein molecule is a non-living organic structure; in another environment, this same molecule becomes a living organism with the functions and properties of life. This ability, to be alive or not alive depending upon the environment, is shown by the crystalline viruses, such as the tobacco mosaic virus.

As we move past the borderline between the non-living and the living, some functional manifestations of life belonging to organisms become clear. These are: reproduction, growth, movement, sensitivity and/or irritability, which are the observable phenomena, and by deduction; feeling states, the ability to accumulate experience and learn, the capacity to develop selectivity and bias and hence to become especially individual and peculiar, and, above all, the ability to interrelate these apparently independent properties into a unity or "wholeness" which we may call behavior or a mode of living.

Another striking characteristic of organisms is a progressive general property called the life cycle. This is a relatively systematic chain of events which all organisms go through. It begins with birth, and terminates at a time called death, when the organism loses its existence as such and becomes non-living or inanimate.

At the beginning of the life cycle the organism is weakly developed in structure and function; is inexperienced with nurture and environment and has little learning; has had little time or opportunity to become selective and biased, and hence displays little by way of feeling states and emotionality; and is weak in action, accomplishment, and behavior. Clearly the organism is immature, both in part and as a whole.

At the end of the life cycle the structures and functions have been completed, nurture and environment have been experienced and the organism has become learned. Selectivity and bias have been in action so long that feeling states and emotionality are firmly established, even rigidly fixed, and the organism is especially individual and peculiar. All parts are now strongly and inextricably interrelated and

* Professor of Education, University of Michigan.

the boundaries between the "psyche" and the "soma" have become inextricably diffused. The whole organism is mature. It is at the end of the life cycle. The next step is death; this terminal event may occur slowly or abruptly, depending upon the environmental circumstances. The processes by which the organism moves through the life cycle, from origin through immaturity to maturity and inevitable death, may properly be called growth. The environmental factors for growth are many and varied and, in themselves, quite independent, one from the other. Growth itself, occurs within the organism, irrespective of external factors, and its processes are never separate or independent.

Heredity is the primary factor in growth, since it controls the basic nature of the organism, the rate that will be used to traverse the life cycle and the basic assets or liabilities—both structural and functional—which permit the organism to utilize nurture and environment in its development.

Strictly speaking, the only thing a complex organism, like the human, inherits from each of his ancestral lines is a single germ cell. These two unite to form the first complete cell of the new organism and start its life cycle. All the rest—structure, function, affectivity and personality—are developed. All of these require elements for growth which are acquired and interact within the limits established by heredity to move the organism along the life pathway. Within the first cell of the individual the most important structures are the *genes*. Genes are about the size of a virus and are composed of nucleoproteins and nucleic acids. These complex living structures are strung together in a linear way to form chromosomes. In the human cell there are 24 pairs of chromosomes, each containing around a thousand genes—more for the larger chromosomes and less for the smaller ones. When the chromosomes are together the genes which occupy the same position are brought into action to produce minute amounts of biochemical substances which we may call gene-products. These products are highly specific in action, and are primary organic inductors and regulators in biochemistry and biophysics. They rigidly control the growth process called cell-differentiation and are strong determinants in the process labelled cell-proliferation. These are the principal processes underlying the physical growth of the organism.

Cell differentiation is a serial and closely timed process which progressively changes a cell, both structurally and functionally, from a very immature one to one that is specialized in function and structure when mature. In the complex organism, each of these specialized (differentiated) cells has a very important biological task to perform by contributing to the support of other specialized cells and in contributing to the welfare of the organism as a whole. Consequently, any failure in the process of differentiation is likely to pro-

duce a defective organism that will be deficient in ability to use the non-hereditary materials of growth. As a result, the animal is defective, in structure and function. In other words, differentiation failures produce whole organism failures. In addition, the earlier a differentiation failure occurs in the developmental career, the more serious and extensive is the later damage. For example, the majority of cases of severe mental retardation in the United States is ascribable to failures in cell differentiation. Mongolism, Amaurotic Family Idiocy, Phenylpyruvic Idiocy, Cerebral Agenesis and Dysgenesis are cell-differentiation failures. In each case a single pair of genes failed to act properly. Further, the differences between the moron and the gifted child are more clearly minor differentiation failures than they are inadequacies of education or nurture.

The process of cell proliferation is one in which cells of a particular kind are duplicated without alteration in structure or in function. The biological term for this process is *mitosis* or cell division. Although the process is under powerful gene control it is also modified, within limits, by the amount and kind of nurture which the organism receives. The size and proportions of the individual, as well as the amount of time it takes him to become adult, in the physical sense, depend upon the rate and way his cells proliferate in the specialized areas. For example, a person who becomes tall in stature is one who proliferates a large number of epiphyseal cells; one who becomes short proliferates a smaller number of this same kind of cell. If one person becomes tall in a short period of time and another in a longer period of time, the former has a faster proliferation rate. Whether cells multiply rapidly or slowly, whether they continue multiplication to provide a large or a small volume organism depends far more upon genes than upon nutrition. It is generally true that malnutrition both slows the rate of proliferation and reduces the amount of mature tissues; it is also generally true that excessive nutrition does not increase the rate or the amount of tissue formed.

In addition, while the amounts and proportions of tissues have some relationship to the organism's development of behavior, the relationship to tissue quality is much stronger. In other words, individuals with high quality and well interrelated tissues have high behavioral and living potential, irrespective of size or gross proportion, and individuals with low quality tissues and poor inter-tissue balance have limited functional and behavioral possibilities. These are the kinds of assets or liabilities provided by the first process of growth—cell differentiation. Thus the quantity, as well as the quality, of the behavior of the organism is basically related to the quality of his tissue and not to quantity.

There are many important developmental relations between

quantity of tissue and function and behavior once the quality has been established. It takes quite a bit of work to keep the organism alive; it takes additional work to differentiate and proliferate cells; further work is needed to keep the cells together as a cooperative whole; more work is needed for the accumulation of experience; more yet is needed to give action and behavior. All things considered, a lot of work, in the physical sense of the word, must be done to develop the organism in structure, in function, and in behavior. Strictly speaking, one cell can do only so much work—no more. When we look at this more closely we find that each cell can do a little bit more work than is necessary to keep him alive. Likewise, we find that a group of cells can do quite a bit more work than is necessary to keep the group alive; and very large groups of cells can do enough work to provide large energy excesses which may be used variably and rather freely to provide action and behavior. The primary task of cell-proliferation is to provide, first, a sufficient number of cells to carry on the necessary biology of sustaining life and its required developmental changes, and later, to supply cell excesses which will give the organism energy for action and behavior. This is done serially and systematically so that cell-proliferation becomes an orderly growth process rather than a cell division, or mitotic incident. Herein lies the important relationship between cell proliferation and the gradually emerging and developing systems of readiness which both permit and partially control the rate and way in which the organism may develop on the non-biological front.

During the early developmental stage of the human, emphasis is placed on cell-differentiation, and cell-proliferation is of secondary importance. By about the seventh fetal month, differentiation is largely completed and cell proliferation becomes vigorous. The baby is preparing for birth and independent living. Proliferation continues very rapidly, although the rate for different tissues is highly variable, through puberty. Then there is a slowing of rate until adulthood is reached. This is the point at which the person has his maximum number of functional cells. He has completed structure, enabled function, and growth is generally finished with exercising a biological dictatorship over the behavior of the individual. The growth biology no longer makes direct contribution to the readiness of the organism to undertake tasks of action and behavior. Until this point is reached any condition of readiness is related to and partially controlled by the nature and consequences of the two growth processes: cell differentiation and cell proliferation, which, in turn, are under the rigorous control of genes.

The general implication to be derived from these processes for education is: to adapt the tasks and requirements of education and

to supply a wealthy educational environment that is consistent with the necessities as well as the peculiarities of the fundamental bases of growth.

If we project this point a little further and in terms of the human infant only, we may note that from a biological point of view the human being at birth has not only a terrific amount of readiness but also has a terrific amount of ability. However, the truth of this statement cannot be understood unless one realizes that the terminal abilities which the human being has are very distant from his beginning abilities so that relatively he is exceptionally immature and unready in terms of the potentials which have to be gradually developed biologically through the use of non-biological material in order to give full expression to his biological abilities.

Here then, especially in the human, the nurture necessary to express his biology will be derived from such sources as his education, his experience with people, his access to inner and outer motivation, the type and kind of tasks that he is confronted with, the successes and failures he experiences, and other non-biological sources of development which have now become essential to his continuing development as a whole person.

Book Reviews

HOME ECONOMICS CAREERS AND HOMEMAKING. Olive A. Hall. 301 pages. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1958. \$4.25.

This book, written especially for the beginning college home economics student, presents in clear, simple, well organized and attractive style, a broad but quite thorough introduction to the study of home economics and the variety of career opportunities that exist currently in the field.

In the introductory chapters the author traces the historical development of home economics and points with pride to the significant role it has played in the whole development of higher education for women. Basic philosophy, guiding principles and curriculum for home economics education are spelled out and equated with present day goals of higher education.

Although a large portion of the work is devoted to an examination of the major home economics occupations the author makes clear in the beginning chapters her belief that basically, home economics education prepares today's women for personal and home and family living whether or not they pursue a career in the field. Homemaking is seen as a major profession, "... the largest single occupation of college women graduates," and is defined as "... supervising or carrying out of responsibilities in the home that develop values in the family members, furthering good human relations both in the home and in contacts which family members have outside of the home, and providing a satisfying setting for family living," a definition to our liking with its primary emphasis on human values rather than solely on the skills of housekeeping.

In later chapters the possibilities for careers in teaching, work with children, youth and families, job possibilities in business, opportunities related to clothing and textiles, food service or nutrition education and research are discussed in a systematic pattern which informs the student about the nature of the work, qualifications and preparation needed, conditions of work, opportunities available, possibilities for advancement, possible benefits and disadvantages.

From a vocational guidance point of view I feel the author does an excellent job of challenging the student reader to assess herself in terms of interest, ability and personal adjustment for work in home economics occupations. The suggested guide for studying vocations helps the student to analyze her own vocational goals and the rather complete "glossary of Home Economics Occupations" clarifies the type of work included in each career. Well chosen photographs, carefully selected references and frequent provocative suggestions for further investigation provide additional stimulation for the reader and help to enhance the format of the book.

In a final chapter titled "The Future is Yours" the author indicates the necessary educational background required to qualify for the many work opportunities available in each of the major careers and presents for each a comparison of salary, a list of possible financial benefits in addition to salary and other personal or job considerations. Graduate study is encouraged and some idea of

the kinds of research done for master's thesis and doctoral dissertations is also listed.

In addition to being useful to the beginning college student, in my opinion the book belongs on the home economics reading list for the high school senior and certainly in the high school vocational guidance counselor's library. For these particular uses I feel the author has made a fine contribution to the field of guidance as well as home economics.

CATHERINE E. STELTZ
The Merrill-Palmer School

IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR SOCIAL AGENCY PRACTICE. Martha Moscrop. 189 pages. University of Toronto Press, 1958. \$7.50.

For several years now, along with other service professions, social work has been grappling with the problem of how to maintain increasingly high professional standards and respond to an ever widening demand for its services in the face of altogether too few fully qualified and adequately trained practitioners. In answer to what has unequivocally become a clarion call for help, there comes occasionally a suggestion for at least a partial solution which bodes well for some amelioration. Not new, but well described in Moscrop's book, one such solution lies in in-service training programs.

Essentially, what the author has done is to describe the process involved in a still continuing in-service training program designed and put into practice fifteen years ago by the Social Welfare Branch of the Department of Health and Welfare in British Columbia, and thus to share with all social agencies troubled with too limited a staff empirical evidence that in-service training can work effectively and need not be regarded either as deleterious or unimaginative.

What any fully trained social work practitioner will append to the author's historical account of the British Columbia program is the inevitable question of whether the profession can continue to make this kind of accommodation to its lack of sufficient personnel and yet meet its concomitant obligation to offer unquestionably competent service. Careful reading of the book reveals Moscrop as being sensitive to the implications of such a question and at the same time convinced that standards need not be lowered *where there is appropriate designing of the in-service training program*. [Reviewer's italics.]

Certainly her book indicates that the British Columbia Social Welfare Branch not only maintained its high standards but also succeeded in meeting a long range goal of recruiting and holding on to "suitable candidates for schools of social work and hence for the profession."

On the other hand, Moscrop makes it clear in the beginning that this type of specifically agency-oriented training (as opposed to straight academic training) does not and cannot take the place of classroom experience, and she ends her book on the note that in-service training for social workers must be seen as the expedient it is and must not at any time be considered acceptable as suitable standard practice.

Without taking the time to belabor the many reasons for social work shortages, both in Canada and in the United States, the author proceeds quickly to explain that in-service training pertains to those persons who have no academic

preparation for the social work function but who, through careful and rigorous screening, are considered good candidates both for the training program itself and for later admission to a school of social work. The training is done within the individual agency and is directly related to the type of service it offers.

Requirements for entry into the program are as nearly comparable to those of any accredited school of social work as possible, and include possession of good health, adequate intelligence, integrity of purpose, and well defined professional aims. Lasting for a total of six months, the program devotes one month to an examination of agency structure, function, and policies, four months to the trainee's actually functioning as a social worker under very close supervision, and one month to a consolidation and crystallization of the learning experiences obtained. The intent is not merely to increase the size of agency staff but much more importantly to recruit new members to the profession.

When the reader has but one author's view at hand, a critique of any historical account is difficult. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that a dearth of professionally trained personnel is crippling to any professional endeavor (no matter what kind of adjustments are made to it) one could wish that Moscrop had been less parochial in her approach; that she had lent her cogency and keen analysis less to over-detailed description of the program and more to an examination of how projects which are admittedly stop-gap procedures affect the philosophy and basic tenets of the profession. For even with her repeated warnings that in-service training is no panacea for personnel shortage, there remains a note of uncertainty as to how such a program really affects the field. What about the almost exaggerated amount of lip-service paid to the notion that professional training not only teaches theory and provides techniques but also disciplines the behavior and professional approach of the student? Exaggerated or not, shall the important aspects of this notion be abandoned in favor of Moscrop's spelled out remarks on the importance of emptying out ash trays and properly signing library cards?

The reviewer's remarks are not intended to undermine the values inherent in in-service training programs, but rather to point out that Moscrop seems to demonstrate undue fervor in her espousal of them. She would have done well to say more about the conditions which make them necessary and to examine the quality and quantity of influence explicit in their use. From certain passages in the book, however, one suspects that a second volume would find the author covering these very issues and that she herself felt hampered by the limitations imposed by a single volume on the subject.

HELEN SUMNER

The Merrill-Palmer School

Book briefs

SOCIAL THEORY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE. Robert King Merton. 645 pages. Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1958. \$7.50.

Somewhat more than a third of the contents of this revised edition is new. The principal changes consist of four new chapters. Two of these come from published symposia. The first is part of a continuing series of studies by the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research dealing with the role of personal influence in society. It sets forth the concept of "the influential"; identifies two distinct types of the influential, "local" and "cosmopolitan," and relates these types to the structure of influence in the local community. The second draws upon the evidence provided by *The American Soldier* to formulate certain conditions under which people orient themselves to the norms of various groups, in particular the group to which they are not affiliated.

The other two chapters added to this edition have not been published before. One tries to consolidate recent empirical and theoretical analyses of the sources and consequences of anomie. The other tries to bring out some of the sociological implications of current inquiries into reference group behavior.

Two new bibliographic postscripts review recent developments in the use of functional analysis in sociology and the role of Puritanism in the development of modern science.

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY. L. E. Cole and W. F. Bruce. 704 pages. World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1958. \$6.25.

Like the 1950 edition, the present volume is a bio-social psychology. The text presents the step-by-step growth and development of the individual in his culture, stressing the importance of education at each step and the role of the teacher as a key participant in the learning process. Chapters dealing with the development of the self—emotion, motivation, and the maturing personality—have been rewritten and expanded. Supplementary aids to the student include an extensive bibliography and a listing of pertinent audio-visual aids. At the end of each chapter is a list of suggested activities and topics for class discussion.

DISASTER: A PSYCHOLOGICAL ESSAY. Martha Wolfenstein, 231 pages. Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957. \$4.00.

In this book Dr. Wolfenstein applies her keen grasp of psychoanalytic theory and the implications of what is known about national character to the study of how people react to large-scale disaster. She presents numerous hypotheses about emotional reactions to disaster that are suggested by current research. The materials on which this is mainly based were gathered by field teams in recent peacetime disasters, particularly tornadoes. Records of other catastrophic experiences—in earthquakes, fires, floods, shipwrecks, and wartime bombings—have also been drawn upon.

This book reconstructs and interprets psychologically the variety of experiences of disaster victims. It begins with an analysis of remote threats and proceeds through the moment of impact of a disaster to the range of after-effects. Although the focus is on large-scale disaster, the book is a mine of insights which should be invaluable to anyone concerned with understanding or studying the psychology of all kinds of stress.

BOOKS ABOUT PARENTS AND THEIR CHILDREN. Jean G. Rex with the Book Review Committee of the Child Study Association of America. 88 pages. Child Study Association of America, New York, 1958. \$.75

Designed to help parents and all who work with families locate at a glance the best books on any subject in child care and family life—from nursery schools to adolescence, from adoption to sex education—this one-volume guide evaluates nearly 400 titles. It includes books for the layman and for the specialist, practical guides and significant theory concerning childbirth, infant care, the childhood years, adolescence and adult members of the family. Here, too, are books on children's reading, play and the arts, as well as on schools and education, delinquency and special handicaps.

EDUCATING GIFTED CHILDREN. Robert F. DeHaan and Robert J. Havighurst. 275 pages. University of Chicago Press, 1957. \$5.00

This book presents a practical approach used in a search for talent among 4th grade elementary school children. It is based upon the actual experience of the authors in a small town in Illinois.

Many problems are discussed, from record-keeping to administration. For those contemplating, or actually engaged in, such programmatic developments, this book offers valuable suggestions. However, if one seeks a deeper understanding of the social and psychological problems involved in such educational plans, he will be disappointed, since the material is relatively sparse and superficial in discussing the psychological and social aspects of gifted children. Inasmuch as its purpose does not seem to be that, it is a clear, useful presentation of an apparently successful program. Further, it is based on an action program, and this enhances its utility.

Y
x-
d
s.
ch
ne

w
dy

ce
ry
de
st,
he
are
ca-

75

ng
of

For
ats,
er-
nal
er-
In-
ion
m,